

Office of the Director
111 N. Front St., 8th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-7795
(614) 645-6675 (FAX)

Planning Division
111 N. Front St., 3rd Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8664

Downtown Commission
Daniel J. Thomas (Staff)
Urban Design Manager
(614) 645-8404
djthomas@columbus.gov

DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Tuesday, July 24, 2018 - 8:30 AM

**111 N. Front Street, Michael B. Coleman Government Center
Hearing Room (Second Floor)**

I. Attendance

Present: Steve Wittmann (Chair); Otto Beatty, Jr.; Tedd Hardesty; Kyle Katz; Robert Loversidge; Mike Lusk; Jana Maniace; Danni Palmore

Absent: None

City Staff: Daniel Thomas, Dan Blechschmidt; Anthony Celebrezze

II. Approval of the June 26, 2018 Downtown Commission Meeting Results

Motion to approve KK, DP 2nd (8-0)

26:00

III. OLD BUSINESS - Review and Approval of Details from a Prior Cases

Case #1 18-7-1

26:40

Address: 65 S. Washington Ave.

Block bound by E. Oak, S. Washington, Library Park Dr. (North) & S. 9th

Applicant and Design Professional: Jay Boone / Moody Nolan, Architecture

EDGE Group, Landscape Architecture

Property Owner: Mike Lisi / Motorists Insurance Group

Attorney Michael B. Coleman / Ice Miller

Action:

Review and approval of north elevation detail.

At the December the Downtown Commission moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) for this project under the condition that the applicant return for approval of details on the north (Oak Street) Elevation. At last month's meeting (see draft Results) the Commission approved the following:

- A four inch pilaster and swapping out the colors of brick and creating periodic pockets for ivy. If you can't meet these conditions come back to the Commission.

The applicant is returning over issues concerning some of the conditions.

Discussion – MN – 3" pilaster is to accommodate the structure. Currently at site compliance review. Right now the sidewalk is very constricted for both sidewalk and trees. The distance between the curb and the wall is 10'. The tree grates are 5'. The screening will be a lighter shade of gray to contrast with the black trim and there will be a differentiation with the brick.

RL - Address the ivy. Why can you provide 4 inches? MN – too much constriction of sidewalk, ADA and strollers. EG – 10' is minimum in the Streetscape Standards. RL – we asked for a few simple changes and they aren't going most of them. These are tiny changes. KK – I can understand issues with the pilasters and foundation. SW – I think the 3 inches would stand out enough. RL – I'm also okay with the very subtle brick color changes. EG – I think that 6 inches minimum would be required and this conflicts with the sidewalk width and isn't really that sustainable.

JM – I think you've made a good compromise in trying to address the conditions. I'm wondering if the balconies above could have some greenery cascading down. MN – we have considered this, but we have concerns about maintenance and some invasive plants. Also not idea to have that kind of moisture on the wall. OB – that sidewalk is very narrow. You probably need as much room as possible. In the last few years pedestrian traffic has increased in that area. I'd hate to see that sidewalk cut down any. RL – I move approval, OB – 2nd.

Results – Motion to approve (Lighten color on the mesh, alternate brick colors, 3 inch pilasters). (6-1-1) Loversidge - no, Hardesty recusing.

Case #2 18-7-2

40:00

Location: 150-156 N. Third St.

Applicant and Design Professional: Jonathan Barnes Architecture and Design c/o Sarah Mackert

Property Owner: Schottenstein Property Group

This project was presented last month to the Commission. A Certificate of Appropriateness was granted to the newer portion of the on a conceptual basis to the Commission. The Commission wished to see more information regarding the historic building (150-156 N. Third). Specifically, the windows, the cornice, the storefront and the code

implications of the fire escape that would not be used on a real basis.

The applicant supplied the attached drawings which, in turn, was vetted with members of the Commission who asked that it be brought back to the full Commission. In particular, there were still questions regarding the viability of the cornice and of the fire escape.

Discussion - DJT- report as to what transpired last month and intervening. RL – no disagreement, just wanted more detail. SM – south side will not be exposed to public view. Trying to do research on the original façade, believe it was built in 1920. Was probably Egyptian Revival. The current cornice design is probably not accurate – the original was most likely simpler. The current cornice was treated with plywood. When we have lifts we will pull off this to determine condition and get a better idea of the original design. We can bring this back. RL – bring back more detail than that (submission). SM – we'll show you the construction detail. It will probably end up being fiberglass.

As for the fire escape we plan on painting it a bright color, leave it in place and proceed with one of two paths - 1) verify that it is useful and use it as a fire escape or, upon instruction of the Fire Division, 2) remove, or post signs in the interior so that no one has access to it. Not part of egress path but an additional option. RL – as long as the building officials are comfortable with it, I'm a little uncomfortable with a "dead" fire escape. If it works, that would be great.

Brick will be gently cleaned, deteriorated bricks restored (north side and west sides above 1st

floor). Existing stucco will be maintained and painted charcoal gray (lower level on the north and south side). SW - What about the ad mural on the north side – will that go away? SM – it does. RL – does removal mean that the site is off the list? DJT – yes.

\

The storefront will be an black anodized. With a 2” profile. It will be similar to the windows, which will also be black. RL – we’ve already approved this, what action should we take now? RL – move that we accept the clarifications we asked for and that they come back with the design of the cornice. KK – 2nd.

Results - – motion to approve the acceptance of the clarifications. Come back with the design of the cornice. (8-0)

Case #3 18-7-3

49:22

Address: 387 E. Rich St. (Southeast corner of Grant Ave. and Rich St.)

Applicant: Jim Lytle

Design Professionals: Mode Architects

Faris Planning & Design – Land Planning, Landscape Architecture

EMH&T – Civil Engineers

Property Owner: Franklin Health Corp. (OhioHealth Corp. Real Estate)

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for signage of a 6-story 1,050-space garage. CC3359.05(C)1)

Discussion JL - OhioHealth branding on the rotunda, which is consistent elsewhere on campus. Address signage and vehicular entrance and exit signage. KK – move to accept, DP – 2nd.

Results – Approved (8-0)

Case #4 18-7-4

52:00

Address: 245 South High Street – Beatty Building

Applicant & Property Owner: Lifestyle Communities - Kristin Schmid

Design Professional: Meleca Architecture

Request Review and recommendation of color of CMU block wall on the southern elevation.

Discussion – DJT – Crawford Hoying (CH) will be coming in with a new project that will abut this wall. Initially at an earlier version the CH’s project would have been about the same height, but now the CH building will be seven stories, exposing the top of the Beatty south elevation. No reference was made to the color of the Beatty wall in prior reviews. Wishes to paint a charcoal gray. Idea of a trompe l’oeil was introduced.

KS – proposing to paint wall, a dark gray called “cyber space”. The wall is concrete block. RL – isn’t the Beatty Building primarily red brick on High Street facade? Why wouldn’t you just want to continue that color around? KS – LC has rebranded and Gray is part of that. We did think that we might paint one of our logos on this façade. RL – you will come back to us with that? KS – yes. The red brick will wrap. JM – how much of the wall will be exposed? A – About three or four stories. RL is your gray coordinated with the CH gray? It looks like their building is gray as well. JM – see how the colors would look when adjacent. Do you want it to blend in. Maybe not

enough contrast. KK – timing. KS – we could come back in August and take into account the CH Building color and other considerations.

Results - Come back in August. No motion made.

Case #5 18-7-5 Deferred to next month.

Address: 275 S. Front Street

Matan Project

Applicant & Property Owner: Lifestyle Communities

Architect: Niles Bolton Associates (Atlanta)

Request:

Presentation and approval of colors of EIFS on upper floors and lower brick and stone material

Case #6 18-7-6

59:45

Address: 305 W. Nationwide Boulevard

Versa

Applicant: Katz Development, LLC

Property Owner: Putnam Hill Limited Partnership

Design Professional : dkb architects

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for rooftop graphic / sign

The overall building and lower level graphics were approved by the Downtown Commission at their February 2018 meeting. At that time the applicant would come back to the Commission regarding the rooftop sign.

Discussion: DJT – earlier approvals, work on the building is proceeding. KK – wish to repurpose Business First roof mounted super graphic. Bring back mural / art into graphic with a nominal amount of place (Versa) sign content. Material would be vinyl, which would go over the scroll. Examples shown. Hopes to have a process where succeeding art could be administratively approved. RL – awesome. KK – should be art driven. Will come back if there is commercial sponsorship. SW – do not want to see this as a billboard. RL – approve as an on premise sign with graphics. DP – how frequent would this change? KK – don't know. It will be vinyl, which will allow for easier change out. It's an important corner – we want to see art or humor. Enlivening the pedestrian experience. Once home to highest concentration of artists' lofts in the city for many decades.

SW – basically a Versa sign with art backdrop – we can approve it on that basis. TH – it also uses an existing sign structure. DP – move to accept, TH – 2nd. SW – based as an on premise graphic. JM – would the tag line always remain the same? KK – not necessarily.

Results – Approved (7-0-1) Katz recusing.

IV. NEW BUSINESS Request for Certificate of Appropriateness

Case #7 18-7-7

1:05:30

Address: 255 S. High Street

Applicant: Crawford Hoying Development Partners, Nelson Yoder

Property Owner: High and Cherry, LLC
Design Professionals : Sullivan and Bruck, Matt Lytle

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for a 5-story apartment with 2 level of parking underneath.
CC3359.05(C)1)

Discussion – DJT – background given. Crawford Hoying came in two years ago and had a 10 story building approved on this site. That earlier building shown. NY – development parameters have been changing – construction costs. Idea from the beginning was to create smaller affordable units (400 – 450 sf) for young professionals. Currently in downtown 700 sf units and up. In 2016, proposal had 40 smaller units. Have a contract with supplier of moveable furniture for the small units. Construction costs for the 11 story building continued to rise. Costs had outstripped the ability to support it with affordable rent. New proposal takes advantage of costs including building code changes. Lower construction cost per square foot. We also had to get a little more creative with our layout. There is a 5 to 6 ft. encroachment above sidewalk on Cherry Street. Creates cover over sidewalk on Cherry from Commons to Bicentennial Park. Creates more developable interior. Court on the north side adjacent to the Beatty Building. This is where the micro units are. With a reduced floors we are creating more units with this floor plan.

ML – design tries to be contextual with the area. Pays homage to the Beatty Bldg. as well as 250 S. High. This includes colors. Blacks on windows, dark brick. Softening at base where a ground faced block is being used. Strip of planting on south elevation for ivy to climb wall. Landscape plan distributed. Using same rhythm of trees that were used for the Beatty Building. Brick pavers to highlight entry. Utilized contour for vehicular entry to two garage floors – Upper from Cherry, lower from Wall. TH – have you had conversation with the City or other property owners (Lifestyle, Casto) about future of Cherry Street? ML – also Mr. Schottenstein with Millennial Tower. Block to the south has really fractured ownership which are also accessed off of Cherry Street. The idea of completely eliminating vehicular traffic off of Cherry Street seems unlikely at this time. Little real traffic off of Cherry Street. RL - Is City okay with encroachment? ML – first step is this meeting. We’ve already started communication with OSS and Public Service. The underside of the Cherry Street overhang will be a metal soffit. The garage will have a louvered system for ventilation.

SW – material “light weight insulated brick veneer” – what is that? RL – EIFS, it’s a little different from the normal product. CH – we’ve used thin brick on a number of product and have had issues. It requires skill. It is essentially a stucco job where you are sticking bricks on the wall. If the substrate is not straight, this could translate thru to the brick. We’ve used the proposed system on a 7 story hotel in Dayton and it looks good. You can’t tell the difference between real brick and this. Makes truly level surface. Units interlock. Real grout is used. Progress has been made with EIFS. Light weight enough with great brick look. RL – none of the material is in reach of the ground? Block and metal panes down low. A. – correct. ML – I’ve seen testing on this product and it is stronger than brick. It’s a good product. JM – is there a life expectancy? A. – suppliers say that this product is both better and more expensive than thin brick. The fact that we’ve already installed this at another location makes us feel confident in bringing it to the Commission. Balconies – sides will be “brick” material, rear will be corrugated metal. Bottom of balcony will probably be exterior grade gypsum painted a dark gray.

OB – what are the other sizes of the 1 and 2 units? Junior 1 bedroom is closer to 600 sf, 1 BR –

closer to 700-800 sf, 2 BR close to 1,000 sf. Furniture is called origami and is connected to Alexa for rearranging - living space, bed room or closet.

Issues with putting real brick up 7 stories without relieving angles creates issues and costs. ML – are you anticipating any retail in the lobby, along High Street? A. – we are looking at it as amenity space for the residences. A small bar might be a possibility. ML – it might make sense to move the entry door further north which would give you more flexibility. SW – if you want to move the door, come back. KK - it's an important point in terms of activation. A. – there is a lot of common area that has to go into an apartment building, ADA accessible mailroom, leasing office, package storage.

SW – concern with establishing precedence. My inclination is to say I would not approve this. OB – according to MK there is now so much similarity between new EIFS and brick., and that it is stronger than brick. JM – we have to make a determination if this material is superior to the traditional EIFS, if it is up to a quality standard. If it is appropriate in terms of the intent of our guidelines. Would we add this to our approved material? Over time materials and technology changes. We're looking for a certain longevity and commitment to downtown. Material with integrity. ML – I like the material – you don't have to deal with the steel. Masonry is a product that water penetrates. This is a better product in terms of sealing the building. It is durable. We don't use real stone to make cornices, for example. We use imitation materials to get the look. We are challenged with cost issues. Rents are set.

NY – I've been in architecture for 20 years and I've seen bad examples, i.e. paint to simulate grout lines. I would never do this. The product we are presenting is the first that I think is worthy of bringing forward. This is a newer technology than what was used on the Joseph. The grouting after the fact makes it expensive. It is regular mortar. KK – I think we are going to see more and more product substituted like this. We're going to have to react to economy and technology. I'm open to this. The precedence is important – could we table in order to explore? Approve this particular product, not everything. Establish parameters. Our guidelines do not say we can use EIFS. It would be a big step. RL – we have approved a number of projects in the past that have used EIFS – not this product in particular. Have they done accelerated weather tests? NY – I would assume. KK – have you brought examples of the louvers? A. – not at this time. It will be a storefront frame with louvers.

OB – I don't want to hold this up. Could you give us a differentiation in the costs of brick and this. A. – we've been asking our contractors just that. Full 6 / 7 story brick structure would have to be supported with tub steel columns in the wall and relieving angles to support that brick. Wood and brick shrink and or swell and aren't good for building. TH - Day light court yard. How much detail, does it relate to the wall adjacent to you. A. – this was the first time we saw that they were going to paint it. We're going to have a lot of interest in what they are going. It will be a space to go out on the second floor. There will be pavers and it will be accessible to residents. Potted plants, festoon lighting.

KK – I move to approve, but bring back finish material – window, louvers, colors. show to staff or bring to Commission. MK – 2nd

Results – Motion to approve. Submit finish materials – window, louvers, colors. (7-1) Wittmann

Case #8 18-7-8**Address: 111-115 Vine Street****1:46:00****Property Owner:** Finance Two, LLC**Applicant & Design Professional:** Olive Architecture (Cleveland)**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for rehabilitation of a former plumbing supply building (one and two stories). The building will be converted into a medical marijuana dispensary. CC3359.05(C)

Discussion DJT – background given. OA – looking for approval for exterior alterations.

Building is a combination of one-story and three-story parts. Proposing new entrances and exits on Vine Street. South elevation faces the electrical sub-station. Windows were blocked in and there is a fence approx. 2 ft. away. Maintain the overhead door on School Street, remove the overhead door on Vine Street. This will be replaced by a pedestrian entrance. New Vine Street elevation shown. The new materials will not be an attempt to match the existing brick but will be metal panels. Awnings will help define entrances. No pedestrians will exit on School Street (deliveries and workers only), only Vine. Windows will be a black anodized storefront system. The windows on the floors where work is not being done are failing and it is anticipated that these will be replaced as well. The public entrance will have clear glazing, the more secured areas will have frosted windows where there are consultation and meeting rooms to provide some sense of privacy. In secure area, the glazing will have a shadow box behind it. Samples were not brought, but images were. Parking to the west does not belong to the building. The building is zero lot line. Access into the electrical substation and impromptu parking.

SW - What about landscaping? Photos show rough sidewalk and weeds. OA – the landscaping is not on our parcel, but we would propose some form of ground cover to be maintained and not be a weed haven. No current plans to replace sidewalk and curb. TH – this is probably more than a 150 linear feet. Would Public Service have the expectation that this section would be upgraded to Streetscape Standards? DJT – we don't have a definitive answer. RL – there's probably not enough room there. ML – the block on the back side? OA – we're not planning on doing anything. ML – suggest that it be painted to match brick. OB – Agreed.

RL – very good design. Modest changes that will make this building look a lot better. RL – I move approval, KK – 2nd.

Results – Motion to approve. Paint the south elevation block window infill to match existing brick color. (8-0)

V. Conceptual Reviews**Case #9 18-7-9C****Address: 134 E. Long Street****1:58:15****Applicant and Architect:** Architectural Alliance, Brad Parish**Property Owner:** SSC Franklin Long LLC

Request:

Conceptual review for the renovation of historic building for offices, including new second story deck in the rear with parking underneath. . CC3359.05(C)1)

Discussion – BP - Headquarters for Rise Brands – owners of 16 Bit and Pins Mechanical in downtown. 1875 building. Reopen all of the existing and former openings. Remove paint from the first floor. Recent auto accident took out the east side of the front. Intention is to restore it back. The columns do have intricate details. The front half has contaminated paint, which will be removed. On the back side a double door will be created as an opening to upper deck. Black aluminum windows. Single hung on the upper floors, storefront on the lower. New roof. SW – bottom floor is granulite – what to do? BP – we will try to get it off. We are still doing some testing. KK – what is Plan B if you can't get the granulite off? It would be to paint the façade the same color as the Pins Mechanical. RL – it will be awesome if you can do it. Renderings shown.

Client wished to add a second story terrace with parking underneath. The parking would be gated. We wish to remove the existing fire escape and add a more formal covered stair to the terrace. The west side of the terrace would have a mesh surface with an ivy (Boston Ivy?) product. Window boxes would help promulgate the ivy. JM – would some form of sun screen be in order? BP - We'll take that into consideration. A tree might be also added to the deck.

Well done, great, nice. BP – is there any way we could get the existing part of the building approved so we can move forward on that? We're going to tuck point and clean it. SW – I think we'll need more detail – storefront windows and upper floor windows. I don't think you are going to have any trouble getting it approved.

Results - Conceptual review only.

Case #10 18-7-10C**2:08:30**

Address: W. Goodale Street (601?)

Applicant and Design Professional: Architectural Alliance, Brad Parish
POD – Landscape Architecture

Property Owner: WC Goodale, LLC

Request:

Conceptual review of Phase I of the White Castle Residential Development. .

Discussion – DJT – Contextual slide shown. Background of prior White Castle submissions. BP – Landscape Plans distributed. Second phase of the development of White Castle site. Corporate HQ is currently underway. Focuses on first three buildings (of five). Building 1 and 2 are 3 story walk ups. Building 3 is a hallway corridor with amenities on the ground floor. Phase II residential will be the bigger buildings, which are 5-stories with parking underneath. Phase I with 82 units. Wanted to create a park edge. Scales back towards the river. Building 1 & 2 surround an amenity area with pool deck and other activities. Brick (complementary to the White Castle HQ) or hardy siding (darker grey) throughout.

POD – focus on landscaping of amenity area. Natural river with adjacent urban spaces. Vertical green screen elements to mitigate garage area (Buildings 4 & 5). Keep the river side simple – keep those views. Keep existing trees. Maybe open some views. Landscape parking side. Layout of

perennials, shrubs, trees.

RL – I have a concern that with this parking that this project will look like any suburban apartment complex. How can we make this more urban? It's all about the parking. I like the 3 & 5 story buildings and the relationship to the river. I don't like all of the surface parking. BP – we've studied the site in terms of how much office and residential components. We're concerned about the units and how far persons would walk. Ultimately there are 254 units going on this site. We are trying to create landscape buffers. The southwest corner of the site is a daytime nighttime overflow area for parking. Primarily for the office users.

JM – I had a similar concern with the connectivity of Building 3.. Maybe the use of pavement (pavers) will help. Could Building 3 be moved closer? Pathways or min-park. 3 is in an oasis of parking. BP – there is a sanitary line that is running down the site., which restricts where we can go with the building edge without building on top of it. Maybe we can dress the parking up with pavers so it feels like a connected plaza. SW – I appreciate that the parking is internally confined. You have the opportunity to landscape extensively and not be exposed to Goodale St. What if you increased the height of Buildings 1 & 2 and eliminate Building 3 altogether? BP - the site is a transitional site, is Grandview Yard urban? The site is caught between downtown and Grandview. SW – does that matter? If I'm living on the lower floors in many of the units all I'd be seeing would be cars. BP – in Building 4 & 5 the parking is internal to the building so there would be no views to parking. RL – I like the site plan, I like the scale, I just don't like all of the surface parking. BP – what if the parking surfaces are upgraded? RL – it would help a little but . . . TH – spend some time making it feel like a plaza. Trees are important. A canopy of trees, and pavers would go a long way. BP – some changes in materials and expanded drive.

Results - Conceptual review only

Case #11 18-7-11C

Address: 274 E. Long Street

2:28:10

Applicant and Design Professional: Juliet Bullock

Attorney Connie Klema

Property Owner: Urban Restorations

Request:

Conceptual review for infill residential. Three stories with parking incorporated on the ground floor. CC3359.05(C)1)

Discussion – DJT – this site has seen two other similar proposals – Edwards Co. and JBAD. Parking underneath, building fronting E. Long with 3 units above. JB - it's been scaled back from the original proposal, retail has been eliminated. This building would screen the parking that is behind it. This will be split off from the parcel behind. Lighter tones, a mixture of brick and stucco. We wanted to articulate the three units a little bit. Use of a glass wall system at entrances. Balconies on the upper level to provide some open space as well as shadow and relief on the façade. KK - the windows at first level seem proportionally small. It makes first floor look a little bit hostile in terms of pedestrian experience. JM – I felt the same way. Maybe different patterns or a clear story effect. ML – it also doesn't relate to what's above it. JB – client also agrees. KK - Play with colors – it's surrounded by large projects. Something that engages the street and is interesting. JB – good idea, but I wouldn't want it to be too drastic. ML – when you come back make certain that you bring samples back, particularly of the brick (which isn't a real

brick). JM – does garage need ventilation? JB – the windows should handle it, since it is a residential project. RL – on the parking side, could you get a little bit of relief from the pavement? A little planting, a little something to soften it. UR – the 14 parking spaces would be for others as well as the three units per agreement with the Edwards Company. TH – would encourage screening off of Neilston St., it might even be required. A fence and hedge, possibly getting rid of one parking space and getting a tree. It is a very visible corner. JB – great idea. TH – do you have a preference between stucco or metal panel? UR – stucco. TH – stucco colors and how they work together will be important – be sure to bring them next time. RL – the Long Street façade looks severe – almost like bars on the window (unfriendly). Street trees or landscaping would help. Long Street is a major street. TH – portions of Long are really tight – this stretch looks like there is a little more room. TH – maybe involve Edwards in terms of streetscape improvements, it would be in their interest. JM – working on the windows and landscaping would complement what you have already done, which is very strong.

Results - Conceptual review only

VI. Business / Discussion / Report

Public Forum

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last notification (June 27, 2018)

Ad Mural – ***Bold & Italics***

1. ***15 W Cherry –Apple Mac ad mural***
2. 600 Goodale – Sign
3. ***263 N Front – Apple Mac ad mural***
4. ***56 E Long – Apple Mac ad mural***
5. ***43 W Long – Apple Mac ad mural***
6. ***35 W Spring – Apple Mac ad mural***
7. 201 S High – Art Mural on back wall to Public Service for access to sidewalk
8. 201 S High – Sign – Tio’s Mexican Restaurant
9. 219 S High – GOAT sidewalk café Referral
10. ***145 N High (Brunson Bldg.) – Univ. of Dayton ad mural***
11. 355 McConnell – Columbia Gas banner
12. ***154 N Third – Bobby Layman Cadillac ad mural***

Next regular meeting will be on August 28, 2018, the fourth Tuesday of the month (five weeks away).

If you have questions concerning this agenda, please contact Daniel Thomas, Urban Design Manager, Planning Division at 614-645-8404.

2:46:00